Jewish History (2007) 21: 121–158
DOI: 10.1007/s10835-006-9035-y

Biblical criticism and cultural Zionism prior to the first world war*

ALLAN ARKUSH
Department of Judaic Studies, Fine Arts 345, State University of New York-Binghamton University, P.O. Box 6000 Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, USA
E-mail: aarkush@binghamton.edu

Abstract. This essay examines the initial stages of the relationship between Jewish nationalism and modern biblical criticism. Its point of departure is Ahad Ha'am, the founder of cultural Zionism, who kept his distance from biblical criticism, and proceeds with Joseph Klausner, Ahad Ha'am's successor as the editor of *Ha-shiloah*, who moved in the opposite direction by incorporating biblical criticism into his own writing and teaching. After examining the opposition to Klausner, the essay turns to the work of Ben-Zion Mossinson, who introduced the results of biblical criticism into the teaching of the Bible in the modern schools of the Yishuv. This initiative generated controversy and broad opposition, especially in the European Hebrew press. Shortly before World War I, and in this controversy's immediate aftermath, Joseph Klausner, then in Palestine, published a small pamphlet in Hebrew making the case for biblical criticism. At about the same time, in Russia, Max Soloveitchik made a similar argument in a book of his own. Neither of these two works had resounding significance, but each testifies to the growing self-confidence of the exponents of cultural Zionist in promoting modern biblical criticism in the Jewish school.

In October 1999 Ze'ev Herzog, a professor of biblical archaeology at the Tel Aviv University, published in the weekend magazine of *Ha'aretz* an article that bore the provocative subtitle: "The Biblical Period Never Happened." Herzog no doubt sought to shock his readers with the news that "the Israelites were never in Egypt, did not wander in the desert, did not conquer the land in a military campaign and did not pass it on to the 12 tribes of Israel." Regretting that these and other equally discomfiting results of the "archaeological revolution" had not yet "trickled down into public consciousness," he tried to make it impossible for Israelis to continue to ignore them. It was imperative, he believed, that they face the truth. Herzog understood why his fellow citizens were reluctant to do so. "Any attempt to question the reliability of the biblical descriptions," he wrote, "is perceived as an attempt to undermine 'our historic right to the land' and as shattering the myth of the nation that is renewing the

* Research for this easy was completed with generous support from a 2003 Harry Starr Fellowship in Jewish Studies at Harvard University.

ancient Kingdom of Israel." Herzog, for his part, displayed no fear that his arguments might have any truly deleterious impact on Israeli identity nor did he drop any hints with regard to how it might be reconstructed if the truths he was trying to disseminate ever did make their way into Israel's public consciousness.[1]

Herzog's article led to the convening of a number of well-attended conferences on this subject at universities throughout Israel and the publication of a volume including many of the papers read at them.[2] Vigorous efforts to defend both the Bible and Israeli identity against his subversive tidings led Herzog to downplay their potential destructiveness and to point to their potentially positive ramifications. Jewish claim to the Land of Israel could actually be strengthened, he suggested, by emphasizing the autochthonous character of the ancient Israelites, who cannot be accused of entering the land as foreign conquerors. And "undermining the historicity of narrative sections of the Bible could encourage greater esteem for their moral meanings and their literary value. Perhaps the very fact of liberation from the chains of historical truth will permit a return to the universal human ideas of the stories of the Bible and the prophets of Israel."[3]

These belated ruminations demonstrate the limits of Herzog's heresies. One can even hear in his voice faint echoes of the ideals proclaimed a century earlier by the cultural Zionists who were the first partisans of a marriage between Zionism and modern biblical criticism. Unlike Herzog, however, these pioneering "nationalist educator-intellectuals," spoke confidently and enthusiastically of the ways in which a truer understanding of the Bible would strengthen both the Jews' rootedness in their own land and their grasp of the moral teachings of the Hebrew prophets.[4] Nevertheless, they, like Herzog, stirred up a considerable amount of controversy, not only among the "guardians of tradition" but within their own camp as well.[5]

For us, as witnesses of the latest episode of the tumultuous relationship between Jewish nationalism and the scientific study of the Bible, it would be instructive to take another look at its contentious beginnings. A reconsideration of the half-forgotten debate generated by the activities of certain cultural Zionists in late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Russia and Palestine may shed new light on the current situation. At the very least, it will serve as a reminder that the initial proponents of the outlook Herzog is currently combating once fought a somewhat similar battle of their own. From their very beginnings, at the turn of the twentieth century, cultural Zionists were deeply concerned with their people's preservation of its unique heritage.

The challenge of articulating a secular version of Jewish culture led them in a number of different directions and inspired them to look to diverse schools of thought for guidance. Some of them found their way to modern biblical criticism and came to view it as an important means of shaping "a usable past" for themselves and their people. These intellectuals soon began to redesign the biblical component in Jewish national education, placing it on what they believed to be sound, scientific foundations. Their first efforts to implement such a program, in Odessa and in Jaffa, met with considerable opposition, stemming mostly but not exclusively from religious Zionist circles. The opponents of the new trend were able to make their grievances known to a broad audience, but they were not strong enough to put a stop to the practices they abhorred.

Here we will examine the earliest stage of the relationship of biblical criticism and cultural Zionism. Our point of departure will of necessity be the thought of Ahad Ha'am, the founder of cultural Zionism, who kept his distance from biblical criticism. Joseph Klausner, Ahad Ha'am's successor as the editor of *Ha-shiloah*, moved in the opposite direction. Klausner became the first cultural Zionist to incorporate biblical criticism into his own writing and teaching. His efforts were not always well received. Klausner was followed by Ben-Zion Mossinson. Before anyone else, Mossinson introduced the results of biblical criticism into the teaching of the Bible in the modern Jewish schools of the Holy Land. This educational program generated broad opposition, especially in the European Hebrew press. Nonetheless, Mossinson and his allies remained undaunted. Shortly before World War I, and in the immediate aftermath of the controversy over Mossinson's teaching, Joseph Klausner issued a small pamphlet that made the case for biblical criticism in the Hebrew language. This was in Palestine. At about the same time, a Zionist intellectual named Max Soloveitchik a published a small book in which he made a somewhat similar argument. Neither of these two works was of earth-shaking significance, but each of them testifies to the growing self-confidence of the cultural Zionist exponents of modern biblical criticism.

Ahad Ha'am

Ahad Ha'am paid little attention to modern biblical scholarship. For one thing, he did not believe that "the conclusions of the critics were scientifically established and unquestionable." As he wrote to Simon Bernfeld in 1902, "we know how doubtful it all is, and how much room

there is for merely subjective conjecture."[6] Moreover, on some crucial points he strongly disagreed with the critics. He doubtless had them in mind when he denounced "Christian scholars" who "lay stress on the alleged radical difference between the Prophetic teaching and the practical Judaism which arose in the era of the Second Temple and received its final form some centuries later."[7] But even if the critics' main claims had been entirely accurate, Ahad Ha'am would not have been very interested in them. What difference did it make, from his point of view, what really happened during the biblical period? His famous and often cited comments about the search for the historical Moses amply demonstrate how unconcerned he was about such matters. "Did Moses really exist? Did his life and activities really correspond with the traditional account? " It did not matter. For

> We have another Moses of our own, whose image has been enshrined in the hearts of the Jewish people for centuries, and who has never ceased to influence our national life from the earliest times to the present day. The existence of this Moses of ours is a historical fact which is wholly independent of your researches.[8]

Such complete indifference to the actual historical facts about Moses or, indeed, almost any other aspect of ancient Jewish history might seem to comport rather poorly with some of Ahad Ha'am's broader cultural goals. He had made it one of his principal aims, after all, to publish scholarly works "relating to the life of the people of Israel and the development of its spirit from antiquity to the present day." This was one of the ways in which he aspired to help contemporary Jews to know themselves, to understand their lives, and to plan their future in a "rational manner."[9] It is not readily apparent how Ahad Ha'am could have hoped to attain these ends at the end of the nineteenth century without coming to terms in a more thoroughgoing way with the widely accepted results of modern biblical criticism, and one ought, perhaps, to view his avoidance of these issues in the light of his overall understanding of the place of the Bible in Jewish culture. The Bible was, for Ahad Ha'am, not only "the embodiment of the spirit of our nation in a bygone era" but a work that had risen to the level of a timeless historical force. "It does not matter to us why particular books merited inclusion in the Bible," he wrote, "and not others – because they merited it *they* became what they became: an essential part of our national "I" which is inconceivable without it, "Holy Scriptures."[10] Thus, an examination of what lay behind the Bible, one focusing on the

question of how Israel acquired its basic identity, might distract attention from what Ahad Ha'am regarded as the far more important question of how Israel's coherent national "I" developed and functioned throughout the subsequent millennia.

It is clear, however, that less theoretical and more political concerns also helped to shape Ahad Ha'am's stance toward biblical criticism. In the letter to Simon Bernfeld quoted above, he acknowledged that as editor of *Ha-shiloah* he sometimes allowed "unorthodox views on biblical criticism to appear, but only incidentally." Publishing "a whole series of articles designed expressly to disprove the unity of the Pentateuch and to expound modern critical views" was, however, something he would simply not do. "For the sake of such conjecture," he wrote to Bernfeld, "I do not think I ought to wound the susceptibilities of the believers, and to flout their most sacred feelings."[11] Bernfeld had apparently told Ahad Ha'am that he had written a complete book on this subject and requested that he publish it. Ahad Ha'am was reluctantly prepared to allow him to contribute to *Ha-shiloah* a few chapters from this manuscript, but only those that did "not challenge the sacredness of the Pentateuch – chapters, for example, on the Prophets, the Psalms, etc."[12] By the time any of these chapters appeared in *Ha-shiloah*, the journal was no longer edited by Ahad Ha'am but by a successor who had a rather different attitude toward biblical criticism – Joseph Klausner.

Joseph Klausner's Judaism and Humanity

In his autobiography, published in 1946, Klausner owned up to his reputation as a disciple of Ahad Ha'am. He forthrightly acknowledged that most people believed that the long deceased thinker had had a decisive influence on his outlook. Nonetheless, Klausner insisted that his own worldview derived more from "Plato and Kant, Tolstoy and Carlyle, Shadal (Samuel David Luzzatto) and Smolenskin" than from the founder of cultural Zionism.[13] Surprisingly, Klausner devoted no sizeable part of his autobiography to the clarification of this claim. In this anecdotal and admittedly very incomplete depiction of his path to "rebirth and redemption," he outlined some of the ways in which his ideas had developed over the years and pointed to many of the milestones marking his literary career. But for some reason he made no mention of an important article he had published in 1900 and only one parenthetical reference to his earliest programmatic work, the one in which the ideology to which he would long adhere first crystallized.

In 1900, Klausner published in *Ha-eshkol* a piece that Ahad Ha'am had very predictably refused to publish in *Ha-shiloah*. Entitled *Milhamah be-Shalom* (War by Peaceful Means), it was a polemical attack on cultural Zionists who were, in Klausner's view, too prepared to accommodate the forces of Orthodoxy. "We need to feel," he said, "what the pious have felt for a long time – that between Torah and secular learning there is a great and enormous contradiction." The struggle between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment would have to be a fight to the finish.[14] Yet not long after issuing this bold declaration of war, Klausner came around to advocating the harmonization of Enlightenment and Judaism. This Judaism, to be sure, was entirely unorthodox, and it was dependent in some measure on the results of modern biblical criticism, a discipline with which Klausner had become familiar during his studies in Heidelberg.

Klausner continued, in 1905, by publishing a collection of essays entitled *Judaism and Humanity*, in which he sought to show how allegiance to Judaism involved service to humanity as a whole.[15] He maintained that Judaism, far from being at odds with the heritage of the West, had always constituted one of its vital constituent elements. The great Jewish contributions to world civilization date back to antiquity, to the time of the First and Second Temple. But their roots went even deeper. Relying mostly, it seems, on the work of Ernest Renan (but without explicitly acknowledging it), Klausner briefly explained how prolonged stay of the earliest Israelites in desert environments had predisposed them to adopt the worship of a single God. But since previous scholars, both Jewish and Christian, had sufficiently demonstrated how the political circumstances and geographic conditions of Ancient Israel had fostered the gradual development of Israelite religion, morality, and prophecy, he did not believe that it was necessary for him to dwell at length on such matters.[16] He did elaborate on the way in which early Israelite henotheism evolved into full-fledged monotheism in the eighth century B.C.E. under the pressure of Assyrian expansionism. Unwilling to draw the conclusion that their own national God was a weak and defeated power, "the best of the Israelites" determined that their God was always victorious, "even when another people, which does not believe in the divinity of the one God, apparently has the upper hand." In their eyes, the victorious enemy was nothing other than God's instrument for inflicting upon the people of Israel the punishment that they deserved.

Monotheism, Klausner went on to explain, led ineluctably to the idea that the one God was a good God, the inspirational force behind an

ethic of absolute justice.[17] Pure and ethical monotheism found its standard bearers in the prophets, who were able to exercise their salutary influence only because they were operating in the midst of a people previously conditioned by geographical and historical circumstances to be receptive to their ideas.[18] The prophets themselves were no more capable of believing that their highest ideals would remain unrealized than they were capable of believing that God would never be victorious. Evil, they had to conclude, would ultimately come to an end in this world, even if this did not occur until "the end of days," the time of the messiah.[19] Its elimination was the goal of history.

Klausner thus sought to show how Israel's experience in its own land had given rise to "the two great original forces whose impact on the entirety of mankind was always great and vast and has still not ceased: *the ethical teachings of the prophets and also the religious views and messianic hopes*" that nurtured the religion that spread throughout the civilized world (Christianity). He delimited rather precisely the periods of Israel's greatest originality. "Prophecy developed and arrived at its true peak toward the end of the days of the First Temple."[20] Similarly, the messianic idea came to full fruition about 200 years before the destruction of the second Temple. These two periods "should have been the focal points of research into the history of Israel, for these times witnessed the maturation of Israel's fundamental national ideas, that is to say, the ones that later became the shared possessions of humanity in general." It was too bad, complained Klausner, that "*Christian* scholars" were occupying themselves with the study of these periods, but that Jews scarcely did so at all.[21]

Klausner's evolutionary understanding of Judaism clearly drew upon the work of Wellhausen, whom he was not reluctant to name (or to criticize). He favorably contrasted him with such German Jewish historians as Zunz, Geiger, and Graetz. The ethnocentric insularity of the latter had led younger Jews to ignore them, according to Klausner, and to flock to the books of Renan and Wellhausen. Despite their manifold faults, these works at least had the merit of allotting "to the ancient Hebrews an important part in the development of the religious and moral views of humanity as a whole."[22] By highlighting the vital contribution of the ancient Jews to Western civilization Klausner hoped to stimulate their descendants' pride in their own heritage and to stem their flight toward the apparently superior culture of the West – which was, in any case, deeply indebted to their own. His overriding concern, however, was not to strengthen the Jews' self-esteem but to instruct them with regard to their mission in the world. Not as scattered

individuals but as a people restored to its own land it was their task to continue to uphold the original Jewish values that the rest of the world had so far succeeded only imperfectly in absorbing.[23] This was the Jews' mission, Klausner believed, not because God had chosen them for it, but because nature and history had fortuitously endowed them with a unique capacity to perform it.

Klausner was not afraid that the ideas of the prophets were in danger of being lost or misunderstood. They were not, after all, difficult and obscure. There was, as he himself acknowledged, "no great and enormous difference between the ancient ethics of the prophets and the new morality of the greatest European moralists."[24] But the Jews needed to understand the crucial role played by their own people in the history of morality. How could they continue to perform their singular mission in the world if they do not know their own formative history well enough to understand what it was? This question would not have crossed the mind of Ahad Ha'am. He did not believe that the Jews needed to update their notions of Israelite history in order to retain the valuable parts of their heritage. All that was needed was close study of the ancient texts formerly considered to be sacred, but now known (by Ahad Ha'am, at least) to be the products of the Jews' unique moral genius. Much more important for him than the question of how these texts had originally come into existence was the task of applying their insights to present circumstances.

Klausner as teacher and textbook author

There is, to the best of my knowledge, no record of Ahad Ha'am's reaction to the ideas that Klausner propounded in *Judaism and Humanity.* But whatever reservations he may have had, they did not prevent him from supporting Klausner's appointment as instructor in ancient Jewish history at the progressive academy (*yeshivah metukenet*) of Rabbi Haim Tchernowitz (Rav Tzair) in Odessa. Tchernowitz, for all his openness to modernity, had no tolerance for the new school of biblical criticism.[25] Fully aware of this, Klausner made it quite clear from the time that he was first vetted for this position that his teaching would be unorthodox. He stressed that he was "free-thinking (*hofshi*) with regard to the Bible and, therefore, also with regard to the early history of Israel, which is based upon the Bible." He would not "teach the yeshivah students that 'Moses our teacher was a fraud' or that 'the Holy Scriptures were full of fabrications and emendations serving

various aims and purposes.'" But he could not "teach Jewish history in the spirit of those who adhered to the tradition accepted among the pious." That Tchernowitz was nonetheless willing to hire him is something that Klausner attributes in his autobiography to the influence of Ahad Ha'am and Haim Nahman Bialik, the teacher of the school's Bible classes.[26]

Klausner threw himself into his teaching, often ending his lessons, he reports, "drenched in perspiration and close to fainting."[27] His claim in 1946 that these classes had an enormous influence on his students is borne out by the testimony of the most famous and influential of them, Yehezkel Kauffman.[28] But Klausner also reports how his "heresies" led to demands that he begin his course not with the earliest history of the nation but with the Babylonian Exile. This he could not do, he says, "for I could not explain the Babylonian Exile without preceding it with an *introduction* to the history of Israel from its beginning up to the destruction of the First Temple."[29] Ultimately the accusations against him led Czarist educational authorities to revoke his teaching license. When he was forced to leave the school in the spring of 1908, some of his favorite students "left in solidarity with their beloved teacher."[30]

In his autobiography Klausner accuses Tchernowitz of having unfairly blamed him for what had happened at the academy. In his own memoirs, published around the same time, Tchernowitz shifts some of the responsibility to Bialik. "There was an ongoing war between Bialik and Klausner," he reports, "over the way in which the yeshivah was run. For Bialik was no less opposed than I was to the extremist biblical criticism on which Klausner based his lessons, even though Bialik did not believe in the integrity of the Torah..." He felt, however, that biblical criticism lacked firm foundations and consequently opposed its teaching.[31] Whether it was this battle between Bialik and Klausner that set off the chain of events that led to Klausner's departure, Tchernowitz does not say; he does not even mention that Klausner had been compelled to leave the school. Klausner himself appears to have referred to this episode in print on only one other, much earlier occasion. In 1909, the year after his departure from the academy, he published *Israelite History*, a textbook based on his lecture notes (transcribed by Kaufmann and other students). He explained in the preface that he had altered his presentation of his subject to suit a different format. "But the *content* of the lessons I did not see any need to change – *despite* what – or, if you will, *precisely because* – this content was one of the main reasons why I was forced to end the reading of my lectures at the 'yeshivah.'"[32]

Klausner wished to present to the enlightened reading public a version of the history of Israel that would undo the misconceptions engendered by the disorderly methods of traditional Jewish education. Yet just as he would not hesitate to quarrel with tradition when it was opposed to "clear, scientific truth," he would not reject it in favor of "hypotheses hanging by a thread." "I do not kowtow to Wellhausen and his disciples," he announced, "even though their system has itself already become a sacred 'tradition.'"[33] For one thing, these Christian scholars were mistaken to see the Bible as the product of various ulterior motives and purposes. It strives only to prove that "the entire history of Israel is the outcome of God's will as revealed in the good and evil deeds of human beings."[34]

The brief prefatory remarks in Klausner's textbook reveal something of his method and his goals, but they do not clearly expose the ideological underpinnings of his approach to ancient Israelite history. Here he went no further than to direct his readers to *Judaism and Humanity*, and in particular to its key essay on Jewish values, if they wished "to understand the philosophical-historical ideas in the present volume."[35] And, indeed, in all respects the textbook echoed the major themes of the essays. Klausner stressed that the Bible was not interested in history per se; and neither, it seems, was he.[36] His cursory sketches of the political, economic and social developments in Ancient Israel were evidently designed to do nothing more than elucidate the background to Israel's special contributions to world civilization. From its earliest days, he stated, "the Hebrew people lived in ways conducive to the development of monotheism and in an environment conducive to it, and this it the reason for the development of monotheism among precisely this people."[37] As he had in *Judaism and Humanity*, Klausner emphasized how all of the Hebrews' "principles were born in the wilderness."[38] In somewhat greater detail than in his earlier work, Klausner described how the vicissitudes of Israelite history had served to advance the people's religious consciousness. Above all, he concentrated on introducing one by one Israel's prophets, its "spiritual heroes," the visionaries "who were ready and willing at all times to sacrifice their souls on the altar of their distant ideals."[39] In the course of explicating their teachings he extolled them as men "who wished to achieve justice in the national society... to transform the ethical itself into practical policy."[40]

Klausner's account of Israelite history betrayed at virtually every step his reliance on the conclusions of modern biblical critics. He announced at the very beginning of his history that "true monotheistic

Judaism did not spread through the nation until the days of the prophets." In general, he declared, "one should not think that when the Hebrews came to the Land of Israel they already had the entire Torah in their possession."[41] Following in the footsteps of many predecessors Klausner maintained that the moralistic historiographical framework of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings had been superimposed on earlier narratives by writers deeply influenced by the "normative morality" of the prophets.[42]

Even as he recapitulated the history of Israel in basic accordance with the views of Wellhausen and other biblical critics, Klausner generally refrained from acknowledging his dependency on their works. On those occasions when he did explicitly refer to them, it was usually to disagree with them. In discussing the appearance of Deuteronomy, for instance, he noted how "extremist Christian scholars have decided that the book was *written* during the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign by the priests... and was deceptively placed in the Temple" so that it could be disguised as something ancient and holy. Klausner scoffed at this claim, which he dismissed as a calumny of the sort once purveyed by the likes of Voltaire and Diderot. Deuteronomy, he acknowledged, was not actually written *in its entirety* in the time of Moses. But that did not mean that the discovery of this book was a fraud perpetrated by self-serving priests. The book "was compiled over many generations" prior to the time that it surfaced in the Temple.[43] For this view Klausner found something resembling support in, of all places, the Talmud. He referred to the passage in Gittin that says that "the Torah was given one scroll at a time."[44] And as for Deuteronomy's attribution to Moses of words that he never truly uttered, this too should not be classified as deception but as the kind of thing that people had no qualms about doing in ancient times, before the emergence of critical scholarship."[45] It was essentially the same as what Josephus did, in his history of the Jewish revolt against Rome, when he put speeches of his own composition in the mouths of historical actors.[46]

Later, when he discussed the origins of the Torah as a whole, Klausner similarly distanced himself from the biblical critics, whose position on this central matter he reviewed in some detail. The "Christian scholars," he wrote, distinguished "in the Torah between 'strata' differing from one another in their contents, emerging in different periods, in which changes in the religious and political history of Israel are reflected." They maintained that the stories utilizing the name YHWH, still tinged with idolatrous elements, date back to the time of Omri, when a battle still raged between Baal and YHWH.

The purer and more elevated stories utilizing the more general and abstract name of "Elohim" stem from the days of Jehu, when the God of Israel had already become the God of the entire world. Subsequently, in the opinion of the biblical critics, in the days of Josiah, the Book of Deuteronomy appeared, and after the Babylonian Exile two more books were composed, the Book of Holiness and the Priestly Code. The former, dating from the end of the Babylonian Exile, is concerned with a holiness that is not purely spiritual but also involves matters of conduct, including laws distinguish between Jews and Gentiles and between the pure and the impure, sexual relations, etc. The latter book, written by priests during the Second Temple period, included regulations concerning the priesthood as well as the etiological stories of Genesis, which should be seen as something analogous to contemporary historical novels. "They tell about past ages and at the same time they necessarily reflect the time of their writing."

Klausner concluded his rather rudimentary account of the documentary hypothesis on a skeptical note. The Christian scholars, he declared, have elaborated "a complete and substantial conception, but precisely because of its logical precision it is incorrect and impossible for us to accept as it is." What Klausner found most objectionable was not the theory that the Torah had been pieced together over time but the biblical critics' efforts to pinpoint the origin of particular texts or segments of texts. How, for instance, could one attribute the Priestly Code to the priests of the early Second Temple period? The book exalted the High Priesthood at the very time when the utterly disgraceful Eliashiv held this position. According to Klausner, this constituted "a living contradiction of the idea that this Code was written by priests!"

> In general [Klausner wrote], one should not cut the Torah with a scalpel into chapters and verses and fragments of verses and decide that this part was written to meet the *needs* of this period and another part was written to meet the *needs* of another period. Books *like these*, on which the life of an entire nation hinges, are not created to meet the needs of the hour. They come into being little by little, in the course of a long line of generations.

And here he quoted once again the Talmudic passage that spoke of the Torah having been given "scroll by scroll." Just like the Book of Deuteronomy, the Torah as a whole was the outcome of an incremental process of development.[47]

In his *Israelite History*, Klausner lived up to his initial promise to survey the biblical period without adhering slavishly to either Jewish tradition or the new tradition of modern biblical criticism. But he did not exactly pursue a middle path between these two opposite poles. Although he made a very visible attempt to underscore his differences with the Christian critics, he was obviously in essential agreement with them on most matters of central significance. Yet Klausner was at odds with them over the antinomianism that pervades their work, which has no echo at all in his lessons on the biblical period. In Klausner's eyes, the Torah amounted not to the petrifying of prophetic idealism but its necessary embodiment in statute. "The highest conceptions of every religion have to take on some particular form in order to penetrate into the life of the people. For the rank and file of the latter is unable to live on the basis of intellectual abstraction alone. And the form that these religious conceptions assume is the practical commandments."[48]

Klausner's critic

If Klausner hoped that his relatively conservative strategy would disarm his traditionalist critics, he was to some extent disappointed. The sections of *Israelite History* covering the biblical period were the targets in 1910 of an entire book, *Keshet u-Magen*, written by a certain David Kriwitski.[49] For Kriwitski, Klausner was no better than the anti-Semitic Christian biblical scholars from whom he sought vainly to distinguish himself. Klausner had attempted to put distance between himself and the Christian biblical critics who made the mistake of seeing in the Bible "ulterior intentions and purposes." But what difference was there, Kriwitski complained, between the Christians, who claimed that the Bible's authors deviated from the truth for many different reasons and Klausner, who held that they parted from the truth for the sole purpose of reinforcing their religious message.[50] Nor were Klausner's supposed corrections of the biblical narrative any more persuasive than those of his Christian mentors.

Kriwitski was particularly incensed by Klausner's topological explanation of Israel's penchant for monotheism. Were the Jews, he asked, the only ancient Near Eastern people who had had prolonged exposure to the desert. All of the other peoples from the surrounding region had shown no special inclination to monotheism. So why should it have arisen in Israel alone? The Hebrews had already resided in

developed regions of Egypt for hundreds of years prior to their stay in Sinai, yet this experience had not blocked their subsequent ascent to a higher level of religious consciousness.[51] But if "Mr. Klausner," for his part, were to experiment with life in the fiercest desert, Kriwitski proclaimed,

> He would see whether he would not return from there a denier of the God of Israel just as he was when he taught the lessons in this book to the hearers of his lectures at the yeshivah that was founded in Odessa to uphold the glory of the Torah and the wisdom of Israel...!"[52]

Kriwitski was moved to angry denunciation of Klausner yet again when he considered his account of the emergence of the Book of Deuteronomy. Klausner's comparison of the Deuteronomist to Josephus was, in his eyes, utterly beside the point. Had he wished to do so, Josephus, as a contemporary of Titus and Agrippa, could have transcribed their speeches more or less accurately.

> But the Book of Deuteronomy in his opinion was written at a very late date, and its author was not able to transmit in the name of Moses words that were uttered by him, but only words that he did not say at all. He was therefore a simple forger, who freely invented lies in the name of Moses![53]

If it was perverse of Klausner to compare the author of Deuteronomy to Josephus, and it was positively outrageous for him to recruit the passage from *Gittin* concerning the "scroll by scroll" composition of the Torah in support of his position. In doing so, wrote Kriwitski, Klausner was "throwing dust in the eyes of his readers, so that they would follow him with their eyes closed, thinking that the holy sages shared this idea." Anyone who looks at the passage Klausner cited, Kriwitski correctly insisted, would see that it has an entirely different significance from the one he attributed to it.[54] Klausner's reuse of the same Talmudic passage to account for the composition of the Torah as a whole was something Kriwitski did not deign to notice.

Klausner, for his part, never responded in any way to Kriwitski's comprehensive effort to demonstrate that he was no better than the Gentile scholars from whom he sought to distance himself. Klausner's brief mention of his book in his autobiography gives us no reason to believe that he took it seriously, and if it caused him any discomfort, it does not seem to have done any serious damage to his sales. By Klausner's own account, *Israelite History* made a strong impression and

was a considerable success, selling 9,000 copies in three editions between 1909 and 1919.[55] But any revolution it might eventually have sparked in Jewish biblical study in Russia was, of course, cut short by other, much more fateful events.

Ben-Zion Mossinson and "The Bible in the school"

Elsewhere in Europe, during the first years of the twentieth century, other young Zionist intellectuals beside Joseph Klausner encountered modern biblical scholarship in a university setting and pondered the ways that it could be incorporated into their ideology and put to the use of their movement. Of these, the most important was Ben-Zion Mossinson. As a Russian emigr studying in Bern, Switzerland, Mossinson belonged to a small group of cultural Zionists inspired by Chaim Weizmann with the idea of establishing a Hebrew Gymnasium in Palestine.[56] The idea was anything but impractical. There was a real demand for such a school among the members of the nascent Palestinian Jewish middle class, who were eager to have their children prepared for higher education both locally and in their newly revived language. The Odessa Committee, led by Ahad Ha'am and other cultural Zionists, was also ready to help subsidize the school. Within a surprisingly short time, Mossinson and some of his friends were appointed to the staff of the Herzliyah Gymnasium in Jaffa.

From the start, this school had declared its intention "not to interfere in the pupils' attitudes towards the precepts of religion." Its earliest program announced that its curriculum would include aspects of Jewish studies ranging from Bible and Talmud to Jewish law and Hebrew literature, but that "how the pupil in practice will behave in matters of religion... is a matter to be left entirely to the parents."[57] By the third year of this religiously neutral institution's existence Mossinson had become its Bible teacher. Back in Bern he had studied with Professor Karl Marti, a disciple of Wellhausen and one of the leading figures in the world of critical biblical scholarship. The Bible classes Mossinson went on to teach at the Gymnasium were the first in the Holy Land to be based on "higher biblical criticism." But it was not what was taking place in his classrooms that triggered the controversy that we are about to examine. It was an article entitled "The Bible in the School," which he published in two installments in 1910 in *Ha-hinukh*, the professional journal of the Palestinian Hebrew teachers. This ultimately very influential piece deserves careful attention.

At first glance, Mossinson's outlook and agenda seem quite different from Klausner's.[58] He evidently regarded the Bible not as a work of special "civilizational" merit but as the only thing of any value at all that the Jews could claim as part of their heritage. "What else do we have," he asked, "other than the Bible? What can we place at the foundation of our national education? Certainly not our most recent literature, the product of exile, consumed by negativism and devoid of any healthy basis!"[59] Mossinson viewed the Bible, first, as a work that could be mined for information about Israel during the period when it "lived a life of freedom" in its own land.[60]

> In its historical tales [he wrote], we find the most important events in the life of the people. The details of the stories vivify for us their patterns of life and customs at home and away from home, in the field and in the vineyard, in times of war and in times of peace... And the words of the prophets are the basis for knowledge of the development of opinions and beliefs among the people, just as the poems and moral parables give us a picture of the cultural situation at the time of their creation.[61]

Because it contained all of these things the Bible could perform its main task in Hebrew education. It could "place before the eyes of the students the full life of our people in its land, and awaken in the hearts of the little Hebrews a great love for this life and a strong yearning to renew the days of our people as of old."

The Bible could only achieve this goal if it were approached by some other means than the traditional Jewish mode of interpretation. Mossinson believed that the teachers of "the little Hebrews," could undo the errors of their predecessors by presenting the biblical material "in proper perspective" and putting all parts of the picture in *their proper place.*" The accomplishment of this purpose would require familiarity on the part of the teacher with such auxiliary studies as archeology and ethnography.[62] It would surely necessitate recourse to the literature of modern biblical criticism. The Gentiles had already produced a considerable number of such writings Mossinson gratefully observed, and he was pleased to note that Hebrew writers were also beginning to establish themselves in the field. He mentioned specifically the books and articles of Klausner, Bernfeld, and others.[63]

Mossinson did not recommend, as one might have expected, that Jewish Bible teachers obtain Klausner's recently published textbook

for use in their own classes. He pointed instead to the need for suitably organized chrestomathies or anthologies of biblical texts. These should commence, he said, not with stories of miraculous deliverance but with

> Natural, simple stories that are based on the reciprocal connection between the people and the land, that show the influence of the mountains of the Land of Israel and its valleys, its skies and its seas, on the events in the life of the people of Israel.

Teachers should proceed with stories that illustrate the dramatic progress the Israelites made from the time of their arrival in the land as "a group of half-wild nomad tribes" to the time when they created their own "high culture." It was crucial that these stories follow the path taken by Israel through all stages of its development, from the crudest idol-worship to the belief in one God, purified by means of the moral basis of the prophets of Israel." They could thus awaken in young people's hearts "feelings of love and respect for their people" that would draw them "to the work of renewal."[64]

Mossinson harked back to the natural and free character of life in Ancient Israel in a way that Klausner did not, but this should not obscure the fact that he insisted no less emphatically than Klausner on the paramount importance of the prophetic message. While not affirming, as had Klausner, the existence of a special Jewish mission, he asserted that "the ideas of the prophets of Israel have great value today, for mankind has not yet reached the high and elevated goal that the prophets set for it. It is therefore necessary for this part of the Holy Scriptures to play a prominent role in the education of the young generation of Hebrews."[65] Mossinson granted that the prophets were stirred into action by what they believed to be the voice of God in their hearts, but he did not consider it to be the task of the Bible teacher to judge the validity of such convictions. He took pains, however, to emphasize that "it is a mistake to think that the prophets are only religious fighters." Contrary to their image in Jewish tradition and in the writings of the Christian biblical critics, they are also "nationalist activists" (*askanim le'umiim*) in the fullest sense of the term. The fact that the prophets couched their speeches in religious language was to be explained, for the most part, by the ancient Hebrews' lack of any ready alternative. Even while operating within the constraints of their culture, they managed to introduce new concepts "in accordance with the requirements of the situation, the place, and the time."[66] Hence, if

we wish to understand the evolution of the prophets' ideas, we must "pay attention to their historical surroundings. And this evolution, which discloses to us the development of the spiritual life of our people throughout a long and brilliant period, is what is of fundamental importance in the books of the prophets."[67]

Mossinson believed that a proper introduction to the history of these prophetic ideas required a new kind of instruction. One could not simply present the books of the prophets to the students as one unit and read them sequentially. The texts were quite garbled and needed to be rearranged. Reflecting on this problem, Mossinson cited two Talmudic adages. Like Klausner, he noted that the Torah was given "scroll by scroll." And somewhat mischievously he noted that there is "no early and late in the Torah."[68]

To remedy the defects of the texts it is necessary to repair the often-sloppy work of their editors, Mossinson wrote, in order to enhance their "external beauty and internal strength." The writings of the prophets, too, should be presented to students in chrestomathies that combine information contextualizing their respective messages with selected and carefully emended passages from their books.[69] Only to students who had first been suitably acquainted with the rest of the Bible might it be appropriate to introduce the Bible's legal material, although how this ought to be done was a complicated matter. The development of the laws was still the subject of scholarly disagreement, but, more important, "the question touches directly upon the fundamental principles of religion, and here the school has to remain in a neutral position." The only thing of which Mossinson seems to have been certain was that one "ought to postpone this subject as long as possible, so that it will not become mechanical, lifeless, and valueless."[70]

Toward the end of his article, Mossinson forthrightly acknowledged that his proposals were controversial. "Biblical criticism is upon us!" he imagined many people wailing. "And criticism is the work of the Gentiles!" Others he imagined saying that "criticism in itself may be all right, but there is no place for it in schools for small children." Endeavoring to preempt such objections, Mossinson granted that biblical criticism had been primarily the work of Gentiles, which – in his opinion, no less than it was in Klausner's – was the Jews' great shame. Still, whatever its shortcomings, it was necessary to take advantage of the former's research, which had "created a basis on which we can now build, and our building will certainly be different from theirs."

In any case, Mossinson did not recommend teaching biblical criticism in the schools. He proposed instead to put in students' hands a *mikra mevukar*, a digest of biblical passages edited in the light of biblical criticism. The teacher (and the teacher alone) needed to be acquainted with modern criticism, enabling an orderly and illuminating presentation of the biblical material. Taught this way, there was no reason why the Bible would lose any of its holiness. Mossinson was aware that some contemporary *maskilim* looked back nostalgically upon their days of Bible study in *heder*. He warned them not to forget that they had spent their childhood in a vanished world and that the children of the present generation "live in an altogether different environment."[71] The old way of studying the Bible would be altogether out of step with the rest of their education and alienate them. Only the development of a new approach to biblical study, Mossinson argued, would prevent them from deserting their own heritage for the sake of that of the Gentiles.

Mossinson began his article with a plea to restore the Jews to a life of naturalness and freedom. He concluded by defending his pedagogical program as a means of fending off cultural assimilation. At their heart, his proposals also reaffirmed prophetic morality. J. Schoneveld was much mistaken when he characterized Mossinson as a "typical representative of the revolt against traditional Judaism that constitutes a major trend in Zionist thought (cr. Berditchevsky, Brenner, Klatzkin et al.)."[72] Rather, Mossinson should be seen as an educator whose outlook reflected the not necessarily irreligious longing of First Aliyah intellectuals to normalize their people's existence.[73] While distancing himself from Orthodoxy and remaining non-committal on the question of theism, he reaffirmed, no less than Klausner, some of the very values that Berditchevsky and others sought to uproot. The difference between the positions of Klausner and Mossinson in the end is one of emphasis. Klausner saw Bible study as a means of strengthening the Jews' ability to survive as a nation still devoted to the mission first announced by the ancient prophets. Mossinson seems to have regarded the study of the prophets' enduring message as a means toward strengthening the Jews' will for national survival in and of itself.

Mossinson attacked and defended

Not surprisingly, the first to enter the fray against Mossinson were ultra-Orthodox Jews from the Old Yishuv. After catching wind of the

shocking things that were taking place in an institution to which they were already deeply hostile, they hastened to vent their indignation in time-honored fashion. The walls of Jerusalem and Jaffa soon displayed anonymous placards decrying "the destruction of education." Here are two of them:

> Parents of boys and girls! Beware of the deceivers! Beware of the new free education!
>
> Beware of the new, recently arrived guardians who want to...plant denial of everything holy to Israel in the hearts of the children, that Moses our teacher never existed and was never born. So goes the interpretation and teaching of Mossinson and his colleagues...

and

> In the general assembly of Jewish writers in the Land of Israel that took place in...Tel Aviv Mr. Bugrashov, one of the heads of the "Herzliyah" Gymnasium said the following things:
>
> "You should know, my friends, that we...are struggling with all our strength to remove the holiness from the books of our Bible, so that it will not be covered in the eyes of our students with a mantle of holiness but will be judged as ordinary secular literature in all respects..."
>
> And you, father and mother, how can you stand and pray before the Lord your God at the same time that you give your offspring over to Moloch? How can you be called up to the holy Torah when you educate your children to desecrate it?

"From these libelous walls," wrote Baruch ben Yehudah, a longtime teacher at the Herzliyah Gymnasium, "the fun moved to the hall of the 10th Zionist Congress and to the pages of respectable journals."[74] Among the first to criticize the Gymnasium in print, as Ben Yehudah points out, was the respected Hebrew writer Zalman Epstein, whose article entitled "The Hebrew Gymnasium in Jaffa" appeared in the fall of 1911 in *Hashiloah*. It spelled out in detail an objection that Mossinson anticipated when he imagined people responding to his article with the argument that "criticism in itself may be all right, but there is no place for it in schools for small children."

Unlike the authors of the anonymous placards, Epstein was a friend and admirer of the Gymnasium. He was nevertheless dismayed by the state of Jewish education at the institution. In addition to complaining about the woefully insufficient amount of time devoted to Jewish studies and the students' abysmal ignorance of Jewish religious practices, he contended that teaching the Bible in accordance with modern biblical criticism transformed it into a merely secular kind of literature. Far from rejecting biblical criticism out of hand, Epstein was convinced of the unavoidable necessity of yielding to "the sovereignty of scientific truth" in absolutely every area of academic inquiry, even if it forced the abandonment of deeply held beliefs. What he denied was the appropriateness of acquainting tender young minds with the results of the discipline on which Mossinson was relying. "Before science takes its turn, the Hebrew youngster has to live the life of the nation in its traditional sanctity..." The full force of the revelation at Sinai "with all its terror and the flame of its fire" has to infuse "a religious tremor into every corner of his soul. Evolutionary science can come afterwards and do its work. It can criticize, analyze, build, and destroy, but the fine chords from the distant past and the holy national influence of the God of Israel will remain in all their poetic beauty."

What Epstein really found most objectionable was Mossinson's "neutrality principle." The basic defect of Mossinson's method was not so much its reliance on the results of biblical criticism as the way in which it disenchanted the world of "the little Hebrews," who were too tender to be exposed to the cold, hard light of science. Such premature enlightenment would hinder their retention at a later age of that shadow of Jewish religious belief-the feeling of belonging to the Jewish nation. In place of Mossinson's program, Epstein advocated the appointment of "a group of outstanding, knowledgeable and authoritative *talmidei hakhamim*" charged with developing "an improved program of Torah study and religious ceremony in agreement with the requirements of Judaism as well as the secular nature of an institution like the Gymnasium."[75]

Mossinson, his colleagues and his allies could not easily dismiss the criticisms of a friend like Epstein. Not even an indignant defense of the school in the pages of *Hashiloah* by the renowned Zionist leader Shmaryahu Levin could be counted upon to put the matter to rest.[76] It was necessary for the intellectual leader of cultural Zionism, Ahad Ha'am himself, to pay a visit to the scene of the action, which he did early in 1912, when he spent 7 weeks in Palestine, including four whole days at the Gymnasium. There he visited classes in Bible and other

subjects and talked informally with teachers and students alike. On the whole, he approved of what he saw and defended the school against its critics, including Epstein. The latter's general critique of the school's approach to Jewish education relied too heavily, he said, on the school's own self-description and failed to recognize how much better it was in practice than in theory.

Ahad Ha'am credited Mossinson with having largely implemented the program he had put forth in his article, but he still had many qualms about the way in which its Bible classes were conducted. For one thing, he complained that Mossinson's programmatic postponement of instruction in the legal parts of the Torah resulted in practice in the failure to provide the students with any instruction whatsoever in the subject. "It is possible that young people who graduate from the Hebrew Gymnasium may know about the existence of the 'Priestly Code' or the 'Deuteronomic Law' only from 'scientific introductions.'" Ahad Ha'am was impressed, on the other hand, by Mossinson's energetic teaching of the prophets in precisely the way that he had outlined in his article:

> And, indeed [he wrote], as I learned from my conversations with the students, they really knew the prophets. They know how to talk very well about the condition of the people during the days of this or that prophet, about the "personality" of the prophet, the content of his prophecies, his religious, ethical and political views, in what respects he is similar to and in what respects he is different from the prophets who preceded him, and so on.

The note of disapproval here remained almost inaudible – until Ahad Ha'am let the other shoe drop.

> But how astonished I was when I saw that at the same time that the students admittedly know *the prophets, they do not know the books of the prophets*. One well-versed student, who gave me a fine "overview" of one of the prophets, when I asked him to read a passage from the very same prophet, evaded doing so with the excuse that he had learned the book the previous year and had already forgotten it. And when he saw how surprising this was to me, he added innocently: "How is it possible to remember? *These things are so confused!...*"

This confusion, Ahad Ha'am wrote, was inevitable. The very effort to clarify matters for the students by means of textual emendations had made it impossible for them to make sense of the original biblical text

when they were confronted with it. If a student loses the notebook containing the revised text, he caustically observed,

> He has lost a book of the prophets and there is no replacement for it... Unless he knows German – then he can look even without the help of his teacher in the collection of biblical interpretations put out by Professor Marti of Bern... For as far as I was able to tell, the corrections of the text in the Gymnasium are almost always based on this collection, as if everything it contains was given at Sinai.

Lest his readers think he was exaggerating, Ahad Ha'am corroborated his argument with extensive evidence from the notebook of one of the Jaffa students accompanied by cross-references to the work of Marti and other German scholars. Ahad Ha'am did not want to be mistaken for a fanatic defender of the traditional biblical text. He freely acknowledged that it had numerous flaws. He felt, however, that the effort to correct them was a dubious enterprise that was best left to the professors who had made it their task:

> In any case, there is no place for this in a Hebrew school that wishes to make the Bible the foundation of national education. One does not make a "foundation" out of a tower floating in the air. The foundation of the national education can only be the Bible *as it is*...

If he himself were teaching the Bible, Ahad Ha'am wrote, he would call his students' attention to the traditional text's imperfections without devoting undue attention to them. This would prevent them from finding it "so confused."

What animated Mossinson's program, Ahad Ha'am concluded, was above all the desire on the part of the inhabitants of the Land of Israel to regain a direct connection with their people's pre-exilic past. To denizens of the Diaspora like himself, however, it seemed "impossible to pass over thousands of years of history and to educate today 'ancient Jews' as if they lived in the days of Isaiah." The historical chain could not be broken in this way, Ahad Ha'am insisted. The Jewish youth of today, even if he lives in the Land of Israel, is the fruit of the historical life of "all the generations." "If you conceal from him the later course of history"

> You will make things so confusing for him that will not know what is his place in the world in which he lives and what is the

> relation between himself and the rest of his people, who are still subject to "the spirit of exile."[77]

Yet despite these warnings, Ahad Ha'am remained a staunch supporter of the Gymnasium, and he must have been dismayed by the extent to which his article played into the hands of the school's opponents, including some of the leaders of the Lovers of Zion. In 1912, at the organization's general assembly in Odessa, Zlotopolsky, Rabbi Glicksberg and others sought to end all financial assistance to the Gymnasium, claiming that it failed to provide an adequate religious education and criticizing its endorsement of biblical criticism. Only the staunch rebuttals of the school's supporters, including Cohen-Bernstein, Shenkin, Jabotinsky and above all Usisshkin were able to fend off the attacks.[78]

But the debate was not over. It continued through 1912 with an exchange between Rabbi Haim Tchernowitz and Dr Haim Bugrashov, a teacher at the Herzliyah Gymnasium, which appeared in the pages of *Ha-olam*. Tchernowitz's undertook a broad-ranging survey of the educational situation in Jewish Palestine, from the yeshivah world of Jerusalem to the modern schools in the agricultural colonies and in the growing urban enclaves. He was unsparing in his criticism of what was taking place everywhere, but harshest by far in his analysis of the secularizing trends visible in the new Yishuv's schools. The worst culprits in his eyes were freethinking teachers who advocated a wholesale "negation of the past." In their effort to fashion new national values for their own people, some of them were groping for a sort of synthesis of the best of Eastern and Western European culture. Others sought to "return the crown to its former glory" by:

> Creating a Jewish type from the time of the First Temple, a type like Jephthah the Gileadite, Samson the hero... who lives by his sword and his heroism... This notion has been lovingly picked up by most of the teachers, and they have begun to instill the children with love and affection for these types. They educate them in this spirit... and they even attempt to explain the Bible on the basis of this outlook, in order to arouse in the hearts of the little Hebrews a powerful ambition to renew our days as of old.

Tchernowitz mocked these efforts, deriding them as artificial and deeply misguided. Whatever the national movement had so far accomplished in Palestine, he said, was thanks not to displays of prowess but to the "moral and spiritual strength" it derived from the

Jewish people's entire heritage. If it were necessary to choose a model from the Jewish past for the present day, it ought not to be the period of the First Temple but that of the Second Temple, when the Jews were "most confined in their internal cultural and moral life." "But in truth, one does not create national types from scratch." History produces them.[79]

When Tchernowitz turned, in a subsequent article, to a discussion of the Herzliyah Gymnasium in particular, he began with a surprisingly sympathetic account of the school's policy of religious neutrality. The original intent of the school's founders, he concluded, had been to teach Jewish studies in a way that would not enter into the area of beliefs and opinions at all. "The Bible and Jewish history would be taught *straightforwardly (pashut)* and without any sorcery..."[80] But, unfortunately, the school's instructional staff has been augmented by "a few impassioned nationalists" not content with the modest aims of its founders and devoted to forging "some kind of new Jews, new values." Since they had abandoned the Jewish religion, these nationalists had nowhere to look for guidance but to the Bible. But theirs was:

> Not the Bible of the exilic Jews, the Bible with Rashi's commentary and the legends of the Midrash and the like, but the original Bible, free of the entire exilic environment. And in this way they arrived at biblical criticism. Since the Gentiles certainly broke free of the exilic commentaries and began everything afresh, they too had to begin everything afresh. And in this way they sought to do their "duty," of creating new values, of returning to a natural life, the life of the biblical era, a life of heroes who were paragons of poetry and imagination, that is to say, the prophets.

After complaining about the way these nationalists' impressed a foreign mode of interpretation into the service of their cause, Tchernowitz mocked the dogmatic manner in which they imposed its conclusions on their pupils.

> And this system has another advantage. It is scientific, as it were, and all of its results are true and certain, and it is forbidden to dispute them... In the Land of Israel every twelve year-old child knows quite simply that the Torah, for instance, was given after the Destruction, except for the Book of Deuteronomy, which "Jeremiah wrote," and that there were a number of prophets by the name of Isaiah. And it is likewise a simple matter that the prophets preceded the Torah...[81]

Even as he disparaged the classes at the Gymnasium, Tchernowitz admitted that his knowledge of what took place there was not first-hand. He had visited Palestine when the school was not in session and, therefore, he had been unable to sit in on any of its classes. The directors were thus free to dismiss him as a critic who knew the institution only through hearsay.

> But it seems to me that they need not do so, for I befriended the students and talked with them a lot and took the measure of their souls, more perhaps than would have been possible if I had spent a few hours at the Gymnasium and listened to a few of the teachers' lectures.

After weeks of associating with a considerable number of Herzliyah students of all ages, Tchernowitz confirmed what Ahad Ha'am had already reported. "In the Gymnasium they are teaching in accordance with the most superficial version of biblical criticism." They "present the students with the *conclusions* of biblical criticism as truths to be taken at face value," unsubstantiated by either argumentation or investigation.

> In order to know how to answer the teachers' question "Who wrote the Torah?" the student memorizes the answer: Ezra, who brought it from Babylonia – and more than this he is not required to know. And when I asked, for example, one of the students, one of the best and most advanced among them, where is the proof that there were three prophets called Isaiah, and not only perhaps two and maybe four, they knew no other answer than "the teacher said so." So there really is no biblical criticism here but only faith. Only they took away faith in tradition and replaced it with faith in Wellhausen.

This sad sight left Tchernowitz with a longing to see in the Gymnasium what he had witnessed in European universities: teachers and students poring over biblical texts, analyzing every verse and every word, knowledgeably comparing different versions and commentaries, without blindly accepting anything. "If only we, too, did things this way. But to give children all the conclusions of biblical scholars and to turn their doubts into certainties, I doubt whether even Wellhausen himself would agree to this!"[82]

One of the teachers in Jaffa had justified the introduction of biblical criticism into the Gymnasium by arguing that if the students were

taught the old way and subsequently discovered the truth on their own they would lose all respect for the teachers who had kept them in the dark. But who really knows, Tchernowitz retorted, where the truth lies? "Maybe there is a little truth in the words of those who say that Moses received the Torah at Sinai?" In any case, how can these teachers of "the truth" be certain that their students will not begin to doubt what they are taught in school? "I have already heard from some of the most advanced of them that they have secretly found out that there are those who say that the Torah was given at Sinai, that Moses our teacher really existed, and that he wrote the entire Torah..." According to Tchernowitz, some of these students had already begun to doubt their teachers' doctrines and to wonder whether such rumors were not true. From this, he himself took heart. It gave him some reason to hope that the days of biblical criticism were numbered.[83]

In his response to Tchernowitz, Haim Bugrashov insisted that the Gymnasium was by no means a bastion of impiety, pointedly reminding him of his own appreciative attendance at High Holiday services held the previous year in the school's auditorium. The Gymnasium, he said, was not trying to train a generation of rabbis, but neither "have we come to create new values. What we want is students who will be loyal sons of their people" and who "will acquire a sound knowledge of human culture through the channels of the original Hebrew culture..." This would prevent them from being disorientated and alienated by any sudden passage from the world of halakhah to the broader realm of universal human culture.

Turning directly to the subject of biblical instruction, Bugrashov first declined to deal with the question of how the Bible ought to be taught "on the level of principle." He was ready to promise, however, in a footnote "that on this a special article will no doubt still appear." Next, he chastised Tchernowitz for neglecting to note just how much of a traditional education the Gymnasium students actually received. Tchernowitz twisted the facts, he maintained, when he announced that they did not study the Torah until they reached the seventh level. To the contrary, "the students finished all of the books of the Torah in the lower classes before they begin the Holy Scriptures." In the fourth and fifth levels, they go over the Torah with passages from Rashi's commentary, focusing, in particular, on poetical passages in the Torah." In the sixth level, the program calls for going over the entire Bible and the Torah in general and only in the seventh level do they begin the scientific introduction to the Bible, which ends in the eighth level. Since Tchernowitz himself had said that he did not object to

teaching biblical criticism to students in the highest level, all his complaints were simply unwarranted. Bugrashov was most impassioned remarks in response to Tchernowitz's contention that it would be better not to teach the Bible at all than to teach it in a manner contrary to tradition.

> To this Machiavellian advice, we can only answer that the Torah is the inheritance of all of Israel and was not given only to the rabbis. It is ours as much as it is theirs...And to us who attach all our future hopes to the bridge uniting the past with our future, to us who are seeking and paving a new path to revival in the land of our fathers, who will dare to say: "You have no part in the Torah of Israel!"[84]

In January of 1913, Tchernowitz responded to Bugrashov, contrasting his grand pronouncement about the transmission of Hebrew culture to the next generation with the fact that the number of hours its curriculum devoted to Jewish studies was steadily shrinking. What really exasperated Tchernowitz was Bugrashov's failure to provide an honest defense of his school's undeniably radical policies. Instead of clarifying the reasons for following in the footsteps of the biblical critics, he wrote, "Mr Bugrashov makes do with a mere denial and declares that I am twisting the facts." Comparing Bugrashov's assertions with the curriculum put together by the Gymnasium in 1909, Tchernowitz accused him of misrepresenting what was *supposed* to be taught in its Bible classes. And with regard to what really went on in the school Tchernowitz quoted from a letter written to him by a parent whose children had been studying there almost since the day it had been founded:

> Mr. Bugrashov was not correct when he said that they teach *humash*. For we are already in the eighth level and they still have not taught *humash*. And only a short time ago one of the teachers explained to the sixth level students that the Torah was not from heaven, and that only a few laws were given by Moses our teacher, that the book of Genesis was written only in the days of Samuel and the rest of the books at still later dates.

To remove any doubt that it was the anonymous parent who was telling the truth and not Bugrashov, Tchernowitz cited one last fact: "One of the demands voiced by parents at an assembly that took place after Passover was "that they institute the study of *humash* in the Gymnasium."

The Gymnasium, said Tchernowitz, had clearly made a decision to teach in accordance with the biblical criticism propounded by Gentile scholars. As a result, they were:

> Raising a whole generation, in the Land of Israel, the cradle of Hebrew prophecy and our history, on complete rejection of the tradition on which the soul of Israel had depended for thousands of years in truth. These people have to this day uttered to us not a single scientific word in the field of biblical criticism. They have not written a single decent article in elucidation of their system. They confess that they have still not cleared up this question for themselves, and nevertheless they still take on credit the superficial conclusions of the Gentile scholars and feed them to the young generation, the generation of our hopes and our future in the Land of Israel.[85]

Tchernowitz acknowledged that he had participated in religious services at the Gymnasium the previous year. He did not deny Bugrashov's assertion that he had been moved by what he witnessed, but he did make it clear that the school itself deserved no credit for it. Some Gymnasium students had been present, it is true, with their parents, but that reflected nothing more than the fact that they happened to be religious people. The school had only rented out its premises for the services and had no official connection to them.

Tchernowitz concluded his response to Bugrashov with a plea to the leaders of the Gymnasium to come forward with an honest explanation of "the spiritual basis" of their program.[86] If they would only do so, there would be no need for anyone to step in and clear things up. Then the debate could be continued in a manner appropriate to "men of culture." If this last remark was designed to goad Bugrashov into making yet another statement, it did not achieve its goal. Not only did he not respond to Tchernowitz, but he never wrote the more theoretical article he had promised.

Klausner's *Our Holy Scriptures*

Where was Joseph Klausner during this altercation? He was certainly present behind the scenes. It was in the journal that he edited that Zalman Epstein's critique of the Gymnasium had appeared and he was likewise the publisher of Ahad Ha'am's account of his subsequent trip to the school. But he could not have shared either Epstein's or Ahad

Ha'am's opinion of Mossinson's program. Rabbi Tchernowitz's attack on Mossinson could only have reminded him of his own experience at the former's school in Odessa and further aggravated him. Why did he not make his own contribution to the debate about the Herzliyah Gymnasium?

Klausner made his first trip to Palestine in 1912. Needless to say, he visited the Gymnasium. In his lengthy recollections of his journey, he described the school rapturously and prophesied (correctly enough) the spread of such institutions throughout the Land of Israel. Yet he said nothing about Mossinson and his Bible classes. Still, it is hard to imagine that Klausner did not have the Gymnasium controversy in mind when he published in Jaffa, in 1913, a pamphlet entitled *Our Holy Scriptures.* Here he attempted, for the first time, to present a rudimentary, easily accessible, and convincing account of some of the basic ideas of modern biblical criticism, on which both Ben-Zion Mossinson and he himself had relied. It was not the sort of work that could have altered the outlook of a staunch traditionalist, but it did provide potential defenders of Mossinson with a handy resource.

As he had done in his earlier writings, Klausner expressed in *Our Holy Scriptures* reservations about the particular conclusions to which Wellhausen and other biblical critics had arrived. He pointed to the need for "criticizing the biblical critics" with respect to some of their more fine-tuned judgments. But what was most significant about their work, he said, was not the specific details but "the general rule that emerges from their research in its entirety." The "Copernican revelation in theology" begun by De Witte and continued by Wellhausen "led to the subjection of the history of Israel to the universal, natural and evolutionary laws of human development."[87] Klausner's explanation of the implications of this discovery leads him into a capsule history of Israel's religious development in which he recapitulates the ideas already familiar to us from his earlier work. The remainder of the pamphlet consists of an essentially abbreviated version of the initial chapters of his *Israelite History.*

Max Soloveitchik

A year later, a Zionist writer from Kovno by the name of Max Soloveitchik put out a much more thoroughgoing introduction to modern biblical criticism.[88] Originally published in Russian in 1913, it appeared in a Hebrew translation in 1914 as *Chapter Headings in the Scientific Study of the Bible.* Soloveitchik began with a lament that the

Jewish national movement, in its decades of existence, had done nothing to wrest the Bible away from its orthodox custodians. It had to do so, he insisted, in order to render Israel's ancient heritage capable of serving "as a source for new life for the Hebrew culture that is now withering away."[89] But this repossession of the Bible could not "be a simple return to the innocent, traditional attitude" to it. "Only through recourse to an evolutionary understanding of the essence of the biblical world will it be possible for us to reveal the national essence of Israel." This work would have to begin with an appropriation of "the fundamental results of European biblical scholarship, especially those of history (and not theology), " and an effort "to rework them, and to develop them further."

It was in order to facilitate this task that Soloveitchik composed his introduction to the methods and conclusions of modern biblical criticism. He commenced this work with a discussion of biblical historiography closely resembling that of Wellhausen. He identified three main periods in the development of the biblical narrative: 1) the pre-prophetic, when tendentious interpretations and preconceptions of Israelite history had not yet taken root, 2) the prophetic, which stood entirely under the influence of the theocratic teachings of the prophets, and 3) the Second Temple period, which was under the influence of Ezra and Nehemiah. One could understand the literary productions of all three periods only by engaging in "literary criticism, whose mission it is to extract the historical material found in them from beneath the later strata added to it at different times for the sake of well-known ethical and philosophical goals."[90]

In his next chapter, an analysis of "the history of religious laws in the Bible," Soloveitchik's strategy more clearly resembled that of Klausner in *Our Holy Scriptures.* At the very outset, he flatly rejected the traditional notion of a single Mosaic lawgiving as something "completely contradictory to all the conclusions at which the science of history has arrived." Soloveitchik insisted, on the contrary, on the indubitable truth of "the conclusions of modern biblical criticism that the Torah contains three distinct law codes formulated during different historical periods."[91] In the third chapter, Soloveitchik offered a coherent synopsis of the history of "the development of Israel's spiritual culture." Here his account of Israel's path from henotheism to monotheism and from a free and natural mode of worship to a rigorously legalistic one echoes that of Klausner and, for that matter, Wellhausen. Unlike Klausner, however, and not much less than Wellhausen, Soloveitchik made it his purpose to expose the late and

discreditable character of Jewish ritual law. But this was not his only goal. As he had promised in his preface, he also utilized biblical criticism for constructive purposes.

Predictably enough, the ancient Israelites of whom Soloveitchik most approved were the literary prophets. What is somewhat surprising is the relatively unenthusiastic manner in which he depicted them. Unlike Klausner, he made no claim that they had made a singular contribution to the development of Western culture. Nor did he follow Mossinson in celebrating them as "national activists." Instead, he represented them as the spokesmen of God responsible both for introducing salutary changes into the life of the people and collecting and reworking all of the texts that were to constitute Israel's literary heritage. Most of all, he credited them with having imbued the people with the two ideas capable of sustaining them in exile: first, that God's covenant with them was eternal and, second, that their misfortunes were a punishment for their sins. The "abundant and powerful work of the prophets" during the century and a half prior to 586 BCE ensured that "the spiritual life of Israel did not come to an end" on foreign soil but would continue to develop along the same lines as before. Cyrus's decree found 50,000 Jews ready to go home "and build the House of Israel anew."

Unfortunately, these returnees, the creators of the new house of Israel, amounted to much less than "the future, ideal Israel that the first prophets had envisioned." They were too focused on ceremony and ritual and too far removed from the more elevated religious views of Amos and Hosea. Under the influence of Ezekiel, Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code their religious customs lost their vitality and their rootedness in nature. The people fell under the hegemony of the law embodied in the Torah and reinforced by the philosophical–historical outlook reflected in the Book of Chronicles, which Soloveichik derided as "nomism."[92]

What did this mean for the future of Jewish national education? One of its central tasks "would be to bequeath to the coming generation the *spiritual wealth* contained in the Bible, that is to say, prophecy."[93] Yet this could not be done without a complete revamping of biblical instruction. Soloveitchik, of course, knew that this issue had recently been the subject of lively discussion in the Hebrew periodical literature, which, he said, had been more publicistic than pedagogical.[94] The Jews had to follow the example of the Germans, who had already given a great deal of thought to bringing the teaching of Bible into line with the results of modern biblical research. Drawing upon recent publications by Emil Kautzsch and Rudolf Kittel, Soloveitchik made a few rather

general proposals.[95] His concern, he explained, was to treat this issue entirely as a matter of principle and not to consider practical questions such obtaining parental support and dealing with orthodox opponents. He stressed the importance of not teaching students to regard the legendary material in the Bible as if it were scientific truth and impressing them, instead, with its religious content.[96]

Recollecting, perhaps, the complaints of Zalman Epstein and others about the Herzliyah Gymnasium's program, Soloveitchik addressed the question of how to present biblical material to very young children. On this matter he took a middle path between those who wished to preserve the naïve attitude as long as possible and those who had no compunctions about undermining it. If the world of legend still possessed reality for the students, he wrote, that it was all right to present miracle stories in their unaltered form. But if the pupils had outgrown childish beliefs, such stories must be introduced as examples of ancient mythology. Still, the most difficult issue was reconciling the history of Israel in biblical times with the teaching of the Bible, which could only be done by teaching students about history as it had really unfolded, not as the biblical authors imagined. When teaching the Bible, however, its unhistorical foundations required highlighting. It was necessary to show the way the Bible understood historical processes in the light of the teachings of the prophets of Israel. If, for example, one of the students asks whether

> In fact the Kingdom of Israel fell only because "they did evil in the eyes of God" – the teacher has to answer that the real reasons for the fall of Samaria were the rise of Assyria, the weakness of Samaria and the abundance of discord within it, etc. But the *prophets* saw in the fall of Samaria a divine reproof, and so they instructed the men of their time and subsequent generations to regard the national catastrophe in this light...

In this way, Soloveitchik wrote, it is possible to distinguish between "the Holy Scriptures," in which our *classical worldview* found expression and the history of the Jews in biblical times, which we have to teach in agreement with scientific laws and biblical criticism, in accordance with the students' level of development."[97] Soloveitchik concluded with words of advice on restricting to a minimum the amount of legal material from the Bible that young students would have to encounter. Doing so would help disclose "the real value of our Israelite culture" and sustain the "eternal assets hidden within it."[98] Alongside Klausner's

Our Holy Scriptures, therefore, Soloveitchik's *Chapter Headings in the Scientific Study of the Bible*, though brief and not always probing, strove less to develop new ideas than to keep the question of biblical criticism on Jewish educators' agendas. Both were very soon overshadowed, however, by political events of an altogether different order of magnitude.

Conclusion

If Ahad Ha'am had had his way, cultural Zionism would have kept its distance from biblical criticism. Had the people who shared his overall orientation followed the path that he had marked out, they could have avoided the controversies just examined. Why, then, did they not take this easier route? They could, after all, have extracted what they wanted from the Bible without subjecting it to the kind of radical reinterpretation practiced by the biblical critics. Nobody needed Wellhausen in order to identify biblical stories exemplifying the free and natural life of the ancient Israelites. And Ahad Ha'am had already shown how secularists could uphold the ideals of the biblical prophets without articulating any clear position with regard to the origin and nature of the Pentateuch.

Klausner, Mossinson, Soloveitchik and others nevertheless chose to follow in Wellhausen's footsteps partly because they could not resist what they took to be a body of essentially irrefutable scholarship. They had to reconcile it with the tenets of Zionism in order to fortify their own conceptions of Jewish identity. Yet once they had made the decision to take this route, they found that it had its advantages. Instead of having to explain prophetic morality along with Ahad Ha'am as the product of some indefinable Jewish national "genius," they could now account for it as the outcome of specific natural, social and historical circumstances. This enabled them to demystify the worldview upon which they wished to construct the Jewish culture of the future. Modern biblical scholarship also provided cultural Zionists with a convenient means of distinguishing between the original and still valuable message of the prophets and the later and now expendable structure of ritual law, which, in their opinion, did more to tarnish Jewish culture than embellish it. Klausner, to be sure, despite his strong preference for the prophets, was not overtly antinomian, and he could even find some redeeming virtues in certain aspects of Jewish law. But Mossinson was only too grateful to the biblical critics for providing him with a rationale for relegating the legal parts of the Bible to a corner of

the curriculum. Soloveitchik was equally grateful for their support in his battle against "nomism."

Ahad Ha'am had sidestepped the question of biblical criticism partly because he wished to avoid any gratuitous offense to Orthodox Jewry. But Klausner, Mossinson, and their allies were undeterred by any such apprehensions. They were ready to utter things that might inspire some Orthodox Jews to launch a counterattack against them, even if they displayed virtually no interest in anything they had to say in response to their arguments. The cultural Zionist defenders of biblical criticism were obviously far less concerned with what they considered to be the prejudices of a superannuated old guard than with shaping the minds of what Ben-Zion Mossinson called "the little Hebrews." And there were abundant indications that they could hope for rapid success in this endeavor. Klausner may have been forced out of Rabbi Tchernowitz's academy in Odessa, but his textbook sold very respectably in the rest of Russia. Efforts in Palestine and elsewhere to sabotage Mossinson's program simply failed.

In the end, the revolution of 1917 and its catastrophic aftermath prevented the defenders of biblical criticism from having a long-term impact on Jewish education in Russia. The situation in Palestine was different. After the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the ensuing empowerment of Zionism, Mossinson's plan for biblical education enjoyed what one might call "canonical" status among the architects of the newly enlarged secular Jewish school system. His own former students and others who shared their approach to the Bible became educational pacesetters during the decades when schools like the Herzliyah Gymnasium sprang up, as Klausner had foretold, throughout Jewish Palestine and later, the State of Israel. Their intellectual descendants include many of the secular Israelis who were scandalized by Ze'ev Herzog's arguments and even, as we saw at the beginning of this essay, at least to a certain extent, Ze'ev Herzog himself.

Notes

1. Herzog, Z (October 29, 1999) Deconstructing the Walls of Jericho. *Ha'aretz* Magazine.
2. Levine, IL Mazar, A (2001)HaPolmus al haEmet haHistorit baMikra. Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem.
3. Ibid., 65.
4. The phrase "nationalist educator-intellectuals" is employed by Anthony D. Smith in *National Identity* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991), 66, to describe a category of secular intellectuals into which the chief protagonists in the following

account very comfortably fit. What defines them is their effort "to provide cognitive maps and historical moralities for present generations, drawn from poetic spaces and golden ages of the communal past." These they employ in order "to transform a backward traditional ethnic community into a dynamic, but vernacular, political nation (*National Identity*, 69)."

5. Ibid., 68. Smith speaks of a cultural war of the "sons against the fathers" in which "the secular intelligentsia turns against the older guardians of tradition." In this struggle, "new self-definitions of community are forged, often in the teeth of resistance by guardians of the older ethno-religious self-definitions, so as to lay the basis for entry into the world of nations."
6. Ha'am, A (1946) Essays, Letters, Memoirs. East and West Library, Oxford. p. 258 (translated from the Hebrew and edited by Leon Simon).
7. Ibid., 84.
8. Ibid., 104.
9. Ha'am, A (1949) Kol Kitve Ahad Ha-am. Devir, Tel Aviv, p 127
10. Ibid., 409.
11. On Ahad Ha'am's reluctance to give offense to more traditional Jews see Zipperstein, SJ (1993) Elusive prophet: Ahad Ha'am and the Origins of Zionism. University of California Press, Berkeley, p 80–1.
12. Ha'am, A Essays, Letters, Memoirs, 258–9.
13. Klausner, J (1946) Darkhi li-kerat ha-tehiyah veha-geulah: Autobyografya. Massada, Tel Aviv, p 56
14. Klausner, J (1899) Milhamah be-Shalom. Ha-Eshkol, 5. This piece Klausner leaves unmentioned in his autobiography.
15. Klausner does refer in his autobiography to his essay on Renan's antisemitism and tells us how he went to see Ahad Ha'am to learn his opinion of it. He mentions that he eventually published it in *Judaism and Humanity*, but he refrains from telling us what Ahad Ha'am thought of it (*Darkhi*, 43).
16. Klausner, J (1905) Yahadut ve-Enoshiyut: Kovetz Ma'amarim. Yavneh, Warsaw, p 209
17. Ibid., 213.
18. Ibid., 222.
19. Ibid., 225–6.
20. Ibid., 131.
21. Ibid., 132–3.
22. Ibid., 137.
23. Ibid., 146.
24. Ibid., 118.
25. Tchernowitz, H (1945) Masekhet Zikhronot: Partsufim ve-Ha-arakhot. Va'ad Ha-yovel, New York, p 257–62.
26. Klausner, *Darkhi*, 129–30.
27. Ibid., 134.
28. Kaufmann, Y (1960) Patos shel Tarbut. In: Nedava, Y (ed) Yosef Klausner – LeDmuto, Kovetz leZikhro. Tel Aviv, p 38–9. Kaufmann subsequently became one of the leading biblical scholars in Israel and a figure of international renown.
29. Klausner, *Darkhi*, 134.
30. Ibid., 136.
31. Tchernowitz, H Masekhet Zikhronot, 124–5. Tchernowitz also acknowledges that Klausner was an excellent modern teacher who had a strong influence on the

majority of the students, who regarded him as someone "opened their eyes" to biblical criticism.

32. Klausner, J (1909) Historyah Yisre'elit: Shiurim be-divrei yemei Yisrael. Hotsaat Bet-mishar sefarim shel ha-ahim Blehnitski, Odessa, vii. In view of what Tchernowitz says in his memoirs, it is worth noting that his publisher was a press co-owned by Haim Nahman Bialik.
33. Ibid., ix.
34. Ibid., 3.
35. Ibid., ix.
36. Ibid., 3.
37. Ibid., 8.
38. Ibid., 9.
39. Ibid., 97.
40. Ibid., 33.
41. Ibid., 11.
42. Ibid., 72.
43. Ibid., 68.
44. Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Gittin, 69a.
45. *Historyah Yisre'elit*, 69.
46. Ibid., 70.
47. Ibid., 163–5.
48. Ibid., 98.
49. After extensive inquiries, I am still unable to identify this man.
50. Kriwitski, D (1910) Keshet u-Magen. Berditchev, 5.
51. Ibid., 18.
52. Ibid., 20.
53. Ibid., 31.
54. Ibid., 36.
55. Klausner, *Darkhi*,
56. Ben-Yehudah, Barukh, (1970) Sipurah shel ha-gimnasyah Hertseliyah. ha-Gimnasyah Hertseliyah, Tel Aviv, p 17.
57. Schoneveld, J (1976) The Bible in Israeli Education: a study of approaches to the Hebrew Bible and its teaching in Israeli educational literature. Van Gorcum, Assen, Amsterdam, p 28.
58. For an account of earlier discussions among cultural Zionists residing in Palestine concerning the place of the Bible in the elementary schools of the new colonies, see Yosef Lang, "Ha-Maavakim al Dmutam shel Batei Sefer Haleumiyim veHashkafotam be-diyunei Asefot Ha-Morim, 1891–1896" in *Dor Ledor*, 1996, 111–114. In the protocols of their discussions there is not the slightest reference to modern biblical criticism. What they debated was how much Bible should be included in the curriculum and how much attention should be given to traditional Jewish interpreters.
59. Mossinson, B-Z (1910) Ha-Tanakh be-veit Ha-sefer. Ha-hinukh 1:25.
60. Ibid., 24.
61. Ibid., 25.
62. Ibid., 26.
63. Ibid., 31.
64. Ibid., 29.
65. Ibid.,110.

66. Ibid.,111.
67. Ibid.,112.
68. Ibid.,113. See Babylonian Talmud, Pesakhim 6b, for the original significance of this phrase.
69. Ibid.,115.
70. Ibid.,117.
71. Ibid., 118–9.
72. Schoneveld, *The Bible in Israeli Education*, 33.
73. See Berlowitz, Y (1996) Le-hamzi Eretz, Lehamtzi Am. Hakibbutz Hameuhad, Tel Aviv.
74. Ben-Yehudah, *Sipurah shel ha-gimnasyah*, 102–3.
75. Zalman Epstein (July–December 1911) Ha-Gymnasia Ha-ivrit be-Yafo. Hashiloah 25:355–60
76. Ben-Yehudah, *Sipurah shel ha-gimnasyah*, 105.
77. Ha'am, A Hagimnazya Ha-ivrit be-Yafo. In: Kol Kitve Ahad Ha'am, 417–20
78. Ben-Yehudah, *Sipurah shel ha-gimnasyah*, 106.
79. Tchernowitz, C (1936)Be-Shaarei Zion: Kovets Maamarim be-inyanenei Eretz Yisrael veha-Zionut. Schulsinger Bros, New York, p 12–3
80. Ibid., 38.
81. Ibid., 39–40.
82. Ibid., 41–2.
83. Ibid., 42–3.
84. Bugrashov, C (1914) He'arot le-ma'amaro shel ha-rav Tchernowitz. In: Ha-Olam, 25
85. Tchernowitz, *Be-Shaarei Zion*, 63–5.
86. Ibid., 66–7.
87. Klausner, J (1957) Mehkarim Hadashim u-Mekorot Atikim. Tel Aviv, 183.
88. Born in Kovno in 1883, Soloveitchik belonged to the group of writers in Odessa who founded and edited Rassvyet, the Russian-language weekly published by the Zionist Federation in Russia.
89. *Rashei Perakim be-Hokhmat Ha-Mikra* (Odessa: Moriah, 1914), 6.
90. Ibid., 24.
91. Ibid., 28.
92. Ibid., 58.
93. Ibid., 83.
94. Ibid., 84.
95. The works he mentions are Kautzsch's *Bibelwissenschaft and Religionsunterricht* (Eugen Strien, 1903) and Kittel's *Die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen mit Berücksichtigung des Religionsunterrichts* (1910).
96. Soloveitchik, *Rashei Perakim*, 85.
97. Ibid., 86–7.
98. Ibid., 88.